

REMARKS

With this Response Applicant claim 22 is amended. No claims are added or canceled. Therefore, claims 22-41 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 22-30, 32-35, and 37-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,456,892 of Dara-Abrams et al. (*Dara-Abrams*). Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are not anticipated by the cited reference for at least the following reasons.

Discussion of the Cited Reference

As an initial matter, the Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the obvious attention and effort, and the thorough examination that are evidenced in the currently pending Office Action. Nevertheless, Applicant must respectfully disagree with the interpretation given the cited references with respect to the claimed invention. *Dara-Abrams* generally discusses a DDI (data-driven interface) controller that queries and receives input (the "data" used to drive) from a target device. See col. 3, lines 57 to 67; col. 4, line 35 to col. 5, line 2. With the input, the DDI controller dynamically generates a graphical user interface to represent the controls present on the target device. The dynamically generated GUI elements are standard elements stored in a database, and associated with "generic user events" defined in the DDI controller. Thus, the DDI controller need not have prior knowledge of the function of the controls it represents in its GUI. Consequently, there is no component at the DDI controller that is aware of the functions associated with the graphical components, other than the generic, defined functions given to the standard GUI elements. See col. 5, lines 3 to 23; col. 6, line 61 to col. 7, line 26; col. 11, line 66 to col. 12, line 28.

In more particularity, at col. 5, lines 3 to 8 Dara-Abrams states:

The DDI uses graphical user interface (GUI) "elements" stored in a data structure to define the physical controls of the DDI target device. The GUI elements include **standard types** of controls and displays ... **that are commonly found** on consumer electronic devices.

Emphasis added. Thus, the GUI is composed of standard elements that are not specific to the specific user interface of the target device.

Further, at col. 6, line 66 to col. 7, line 3, the reference states:

The DDI controller **interfaces with the DDI target to obtain the DDI data and generates a user interface for the DDI target device** including [control and display information].

Emphasis added. Thus, the DDI controller in operation obtains data from the DDI target device and uses the information to dynamically generate a user interface from the standard elements discussed above, and the reference fails to disclose or suggest compiling linked source code to generate a GUI for the target device.

Regarding Claims 22-30

Claim 22 as amended herein recites the following:

providing a graphical programming language environment to develop source code for a command-set aware user interface, the source code to be used to generate a user interface to execute at the remote device to configure a configuration parameter of the remote device according to a configuration command of the command set;

providing a graphical programming language environment to develop source code for a command-set unaware graphical user interface (GUI) of the device management application, the GUI to be executed remotely from the remote device;

linking the source code for the command-set aware user interface in the source code for the command-set unaware GUI to provide a graphical component in the GUI associated with the configuration command; and

building the source code for the command-set unaware GUI with the linked source code for the command-set aware user interface to result in the device management application **having the GUI with the command-set aware user interface running beneath the GUI, remotely from the remote device,**

the GUI having the graphical component to provide access to the associated configuration command.

In contrast to that discussed above with regard to the cited reference, claim 22 recites providing a graphical programming language environment and linking and building source code to result in a device management application having a command-set unaware GUI with a command-set aware user interface running beneath it **remotely from the remote device**. As discussed above, the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest linking and building source code to have an application with a command-set unaware GUI with a command-set aware user interface running beneath it **remotely from the remote device**. In *Dara-Abrams*, there is no user interface running remotely from the remote device that is command-set aware. The reference rather articulates the lack of having a command-set aware interface remote from the device as a core object of the system of the cite reference. See col. 4, lines 63 to col. 5, line 2. Thus, the reference fails to disclose at least one element of the claimed invention, and so fails under MPEP § 2131 to anticipate the invention as recited in claim 22. Because claims 23-30 depend from claim 22, they necessarily include the same element not disclosed by the cited reference, which necessarily means the reference likewise cannot anticipate these claims.

Regarding Claims 32-35

Claim 32 recites the following:

receiving source code defining a console user interface (CUI) to generate a CUI to execute at a network device, the CUI to configure a configuration kernel (CK) of the network device according to a configuration command;

receiving source code defining a graphical user interface (GUI) to generate a device management application, the GUI to be executed at a management point remote from the network device, the source code for the GUI to include **a hook to the source code for the CUI** to provide a graphical component in the GUI to operate a function of the CUI to access the configuration command from GUI; and

building the source code for the GUI with the hook to the source code for the CUI to create the device management application **having the CUI running under the GUI, remotely from the remote device**, the GUI having the graphical component to provide access to the associated configuration command.

The Office Action fails to address the elements of "receiving source code" as recited in the claims. Whether or not source code defining a CUI or GUI can be implied in the reference, which Applicants do not concede, the reference fails to disclose or suggest receiving source code and building the source, as recited in claim 32. Solely for the purposes of argument, and not by way of admission, even assuming such could be inferred from *Dara-Abrams*, the reference fails to disclose or suggest having a CUI running under a GUI remotely from the remote device, for similar reasons as that discussed above with respect to claim 22.

Furthermore, the Office Action at page 4 that the API of *Dara-Abrams* discloses a hook as recited in the claims. The reference does not support this interpretation. As recited in the claims, the GUI includes a **hook to the source code for the CUI**. The APIs of the cited reference are functions that can be called to perform certain operations (for example, interfacing with the target device to obtain information from the target device). Again, every discussion in the cited reference assumes that the API calls occur during the course of operating the DDI target device and the DDI controller, and fails to disclose or suggest that a hook to source may exist. Therefore, even assuming the API of *Dara-Abrams* could be considered a "hook," which Applicant does not concede, the API fails to support an interpretation as a "hook to source code" as recited in the claims. For at least these reasons the cited reference fails under MPEP § 2131 to anticipate the invention as recited in claim 32. Claims 33-35 depend from claim 32, and therefore, are similarly not anticipated by the cited reference.

Regarding claims 37-40

Claim 37 recites the following:

a memory having a management application, including:

a graphical user interface (GUI) module having a graphical component associated with a configuration command, the graphical component responsive to a user input to operate the configuration command; and

one or more code libraries including code defining a configuration kernel (CK) and code defining a console user interface (CUI) of a remote device, the CK having a configuration parameter associated with the configuration command, the configuration parameter corresponding to a resource of the remote device, the CUI to interface the configuration kernel with the GUI, the code libraries linked with the GUI and compiled with the GUI to create the management application having the GUI with the CK and **the CUI running under the GUI, remotely from the remote device;**

a communications interface coupled with the remote device to communicate a configuration update for the remote device from the management application; and

a processor coupled with the memory to operate the management application, and coupled with the communications interface to provide the configuration command to the communications interface.

In contrast to the cited reference, and similarly to the discussion above with respect to claims 22 and 32, the invention as recited in claim 37 recites a CUI running under a GUI remotely from a remote device. The reference is shown above to fail to disclose or suggest at least this element of claim 37. Therefore, the cited reference fails under MPEP § 2131 to anticipate the invention as recited in claim 37. Claims 38-40 depend from claim 37, and therefore, are similarly not anticipated by the cited reference.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 31, 36, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dara-Abrams* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,447 of Shteyn (*Shteyn*). These rejections are each predicated upon the rejection of the independent claims 22, 32, and 37, discussed above. *Dara-Abrams* is shown to fail to disclose the invention as recited in the independent claims.

Shteyn discusses a controller having an abstract representation of a remote device. Whether or not *Shteyn* discloses what is asserted in the Office Action, which Applicant does not concede, the reference fails to cure the deficiencies of *Dara-Abrams*, and in fact suffers the same deficiencies with respect to the independent claims as discussed above. Therefore, the independent claims are nonobvious under MPEP § 2143 over the cited references because the cited references, whether alone or in combination, fail to disclose at least one element of the claimed invention. These claims depend from the independent claims discussed above. Claims that depend from nonobvious base claims are also nonobvious. MPEP § 2143.03. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are not rendered obvious by the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that all rejections have been overcome, placing all pending claims in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the above-referenced application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number
02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 4/19/05

Vincent H. Anderson
Vincent H. Anderson
Reg. No. 54,962

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
Telephone: (503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal
service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On: April 19, 2005

Signature: [Signature]
Rachael Brown

4/19/05
Date